



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,164	09/27/2001	Todd Fischer	10012681-1	3933
7590	08/23/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			PYZOWA, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,164	FISCHER, TODD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Pyzocha	2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,5-13,16 and 18-25 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,5-13,16 and 18-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-13, 16, and 18-25 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 07/27/2005 has been received and considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5, 7, 12-13, 16, 18-19, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Klein et al (US 20020156650).

As per claims 1, 5, 7, 12-13, 16 and 18-19, Klein et al discloses communicating an address to a first network device via a secure tunnel to the Internet such that the first network device provides information corresponding to the address for use by a second network device; receiving encrypted information from the first network device via the Internet; enabling the

encrypted information to be posted at the address; and enabling the second network device to access the address and retrieve the encrypted information posted at the address also providing a decryption key (see paragraphs 58-59, 72, 77).

Klein et al fails to disclose the use of one-time URLs and the address being disabled after a period of time.

However, Linden et al teaches the use of one-time URLs (see column 11 lines 17-28) and an address being disabled after a period of time (see column 2 lines 29-32 and column 5 lines 22-41).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make Klein et al's URLs one-time or only available for a predetermined amount of time as taught by Linden et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent the access of the webpage multiple times and to provide expiration of the URL.

As per claims 21-25, the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system discloses the limitations as described above.

4. Claims 6, 8-10, 16, 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system as applied to claims 1, 12 and 19 above, and further in view of Forslow (US 20020069278).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 6, 8-10, and 20, the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system fails to disclose the use of wireless mobile devices.

However, Forslow teaches the use of mobile devices (see paragraphs 88 and 139).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system's clients be mobile devices as taught by Forslow.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow mobile users to select server resources.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rosenberg et al (US 6363357).

As per claim 11, the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system fails to disclose printing the decrypted information.

However, Rosenberg et al teaches printing decrypted information (see column 6 lines 9-39).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Rosenberg et al's method of printing to print the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system's information.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow a browser to render the information.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Klein et al and Linden et al method as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Forslow.

As per claims 3, the modified Klein et al and Linden et al method fails to disclose the use of a firewall.

However, Forslow teaches a firewall (see paragraph 88).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the modified Klein et al and Linden et al's clients be connected to the internet through a firewall as taught by Forslow.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow mobile users to select server resources.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 07/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system fails to disclose: two one-time use URLs; URLs only valid for a predetermined period of time; and the first and second network devices never being identified to each other.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system fails to disclose two one-time use URLs, Klein et al discloses the use of two URLs (see paragraphs 63-69 and paragraphs 79-83), and Linden et al teaches the use of one-time use URLs. When combined the URLs of Klein et al are now the one-time use URLs of the claimed invention.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system fails to disclose URLs only valid for a predetermined period of time, as cited above, in column 2 lines 29-32 and column 5 lines 22-41, Linden et al teaches the use of URLs which are only valid for a predetermined amount of time.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the modified Klein et al and Linden et al system fails to disclose the first and second network devices never being identified to each other, Klein et al teaches a first workstation uploading a file to a server when a second workstation goes to the server and retrieves the file. No knowledge of what workstation uploaded or downloaded is transferred between the two parties.

***Conclusion***

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2137

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is  
703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP

  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER